DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 260 HE 027 102

AUTHOR	Carson, Joan G.; And Others
TITLE	Academic Demands of the Undergraduate Curriculum: What Students Need.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	52p.; For related documents, see HE 027 101-103.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Ability; College Bound Students; College Faculty; *College Preparation; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; *Educational Improvement; Higher Education; High Risk Students; High Schools; Literacy; Public Colleges; Public Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Study Skills; Undergraduate Students; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This study examined academic literacy (the reading, writing, and verbal demands on students) as a foundation for a collaboration between high school and university faculty designed to ease transitions by students from secondary to postsecondary education. The 3-year project was conducted at an urban public university that enrolls approximately 23,000 students, of whom 24 percent are minorities and a nearby city high school. While the basic goal of the project was to create academic literacy descriptions that could be used for collaboration among faculty to create better preparation programs for high school students, it also achieved the development of a model of faculty collaboration. The faculty collaboration experienced in the project provided an environment in which faculty recognized that their shared work has broad implications which extend beyond their individual classrooms. The use of academic literacy was important in helping generate a broader participation from all faculty levels and allowed for a clearer focus to be maintained for discussion and for instituting change. This model has been distributed to 170 academic alliance contacts in a 15-state area identified by the Southern Regional Education Board, and will be distributed to a national audience at the American Association for Higher Education's 1993 Conference on College/School Partnerships. Appendices include study surveys, interview questions, an observation manual, and a dissemination list. (Contains 12 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 260

Academic Demands of the Undergraduate Curriculum: What Students Need

by

Joan G. Carson, Ph.D.
Applied Linguistics & English as a Second Language

Nancy D. Chase, Ph.D.
Developmental Studies

Sandra U. Gibson, Ph.D.
Counseling Center

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University, Atlanta

1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joanne R. Nurss

Georgia State Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE027 102

This project was funded by a grant from the Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Also available at cost:

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993). A model for faculty collaboration: focus on academic literacy. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

This volume presents the model developed from this study of the academic literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum. It provides a means for other institutions to engage in faculty collaboration to determine the academic literacy demands of their curricula.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1992). Literacy analyses of high school and university courses: Summary descriptions of selected courses. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

This volume presents the academic literacy data collected in this study of four secondary and four postsecondary classes.

Write to: The Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

Table of Contents

Page

Executive Summary 1

Project Overview 4

Purpose 6

Background and Origins 9

Project Description 12

- Year One: Data Collection and Analysis 12
- Year Two: Faculty Dialogue 13
- Year Three: Dissemination 15

Evaluation/Project Reports 16

Summary and Conclusions 20

References 23

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Sample Survey Questions 1.1
  - Urban University Pre Course Survey 1.1
  - Urban University Post Course Survey 1.5
  - City High School Post Course Survey 1.10
- Appendix 2: Sample Interview Questions 2.1
  - Urban University Questions 2.1
  - City High School Questions 2.4
- Appendix 3: Observation Manual 3.1
- Appendix 4: Dissemination List 4.1

Executive Summary

Project Overview

"Academic Demands of the Undergraduate Curriculum: What Students Need" was a project that utilized information on the literacy demands of selected high-attrition undergraduate courses and comparable high school courses as the basis for a collaboration between high school and university faculty. Academic literacy thus served as the foundation for a school/college partnership that helped faculty from both institutions to understand better the literacy demands of selected courses in their curricula. The ultimate goal of the partnership was to discover and discuss ways of easing students' transition from high school to college, and in this way to positively affect student retention rates at the university.

This project on academic literacy of the undergraduate curriculum has primarily served teachers, especially those faculty involved in high school to college bridge programs--secondary-level teachers, transition program faculty (Developmental Studies, English as a Second Language, Learning Assistance), and lower-division university faculty. The principal outcomes of the project are: 1) Descriptions of the academic literacy requirements of selected high-demand, lower-division university courses and comparable courses at a local public high school; 2) Successful collaboration of secondary and college faculty that focused on helping students develop academic literacy skills and successfully managing academic literacy requirements of undergraduate courses; 3) Information on academic literacy requirements provided to bridge program faculty which has served to inform instruction and stimulate curriculum modification; and 4) Development of a conceptual model of faculty collaboration based on descriptions of academic literacy requirements, and the dissemination of this model to a wider audience.

Purpose

The problem that this project addressed was student access and retention. In particular, the project focused on the issues of helping students make a successful transition to university course work, and the role that academic literacy skills play in student success. Because research has shown that underprepared students often have difficulty with core curriculum courses and that they benefit most from instruction in academic tasks resembling the reading and writing demands which will be expected of them in actual college and university course work, we reasoned that if college preparation programs are to be successful, they must be tied directly to the content and practices of a university curriculum. We also reasoned that the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in both university and academic preparation programs (including high school) needed to be made explicit, so that the faculty at both levels could become aware of the similarities and differences in these expectations. These academic literacy descriptions could then serve as the foundation for collaboration among faculty, in which they could discuss ways of easing the transition from high school to the university. The anticipated results were better preparation programs and, ultimately, better retention rates for students.

The description of academic literacy requirements is at the heart of this project, and initially, we had thought that these descriptions would be the principal outcome of the project, available for dissemination to a wide audience. However, their real value lies in their specificity and immediacy in the context of subsequent faculty discussions. The model of faculty collaboration that is the principal result of this project centers on a modified version of these data/descriptions which are not only the starting points, but also the primary focus of subsequent academic alliances/faculty collaborations.

Evaluation/Project Reports

The academic literacy descriptions provided faculty dialogue participants with information about the requirements of the course that served as the disciplinary interface at the alternate institution. The resulting discussions generated various proposals for better preparing students for postsecondary academic literacy tasks. Although many of the projects could not be carried out (see above), faculty were unanimously positive in their evaluations of the process noting heightened awareness and individual changes that were instituted as a result. In addition, Developmental Studies, ESL, and Learning Assistance Center faculty implemented various curricular changes in response to the specific descriptions of course demands. Wider dissemination of these descriptions included presentations at national, state, and local conferences, as well as published journal articles.

The model of faculty collaboration that emerged as the result of the faculty's experiences with the project has been distributed to 170 academic alliance contacts in a 15-state area identified by the Southern Regional Education Board, and will be distributed to a national audience at the AAHE's 1993 Conference on College/School Partnerships.

Summary and Conclusions

Although the necessary specificity of the academic literacy descriptions generated by the project limited their generalizabilty for any application purposes beyond the institutions in which they had been observed, this specificity became the most significant factor in the success of the subsequent collaboration. Because of the success of the faculty dialogues, it became clear that what **was** generalizable from the project was a model of faculty collaboration based on academic literacy descriptions of courses taught by the faculty in a specific collaboration. This focus on academic literacy is important for several reasons. First, because academic literacy is a central concern of all faculty, it provides a natural mutually agreed-upon starting point for discussion. Second, it invites collaboration among university and transition program faculty (DS, ESL, for example) who are typically excluded from collaborative activities based on disciplinary knowledge. Third, a focus on developing academic literacy allows instructors from all levels (including high school freshman course instructors) to participate in discussions about the developmental continuum. Fourth, knowing what students have experienced in specific academic preparation classes and what they will experience in specific university classes allows faculty a clear picture of the interface between the two, a clear focus for discussion, and a coherent basis for instituting changes. Finally, faculty collaboration on developing academic literacy skills provides an environment in which faculty recognize that their shared work has implications that are broader than those that extend only to their individual classrooms. What we have found in the course of this project is that faculty at all levels are very much committed to engaging in discussions with like-minded faculty to explore ways of helping students successfully manage the academic literacy requirements of the undergraduate curriculum.

Background and Origins

Considering the generality of most descriptions of academic literacy demands in the college undergraduate curriculum, we undertook this project in order to describe in greater depth and with more specificity the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in university-level academic courses. The four high-demand entry-level university courses were selected for this investigation because they were required courses and because students find them relatively difficult. The targeted high school courses were comparable in discipline and content.

This project was conducted at an urban public university and a nearby city high school. University enrollment averages around 23,000 students, 24% minorities. The high school enrolls approximately 750 students, predominantly African-American. Because the university is urban and non-residential, enrollment is drawn heavily from the metropolitan area. Thus, the academic literacy descriptions of specific courses at this university are of interest to teachers from a number of metropolitan schools whose students are likely to enroll there.

The greatest problem that we encountered in the course of the project was in sustaining a cooperative relationship with the high school administration. We learned from this experience that the support of top school administrators is essential to such a cross-institutional relationship; we also learned that administrative support is extremely difficult to negotiate and sustain.

Project Description

Year One: Data Collection and Analysis. In Year One, data were collected from two sections each of the four targeted university courses and in four targeted high school classes. The data consisted of: student surveys, student and faculty interviews, classroom observation reports, and course artifacts (texts, syllabuses, tests, sample assignments, etc.). Data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, and a description of academic literacy requirements was developed for each course (Carson, Chase, & Gibson, 1992).

Year Two: Faculty Dialogues. During Year Two of the project, cross-institutional faculty dialogues were planned in order to share the academic literacy descriptions with participating faculty, and to allow them to discuss the implications of these descriptions for helping students develop academic literacy skills for postsecondary courses. Faculty were asked to develop written descriptions of specific curricular projects or activities that they intended to implement during the next year.

Year Three: Dissemination. By Year Three of the project, the high school principal had withdrawn her support because she wanted the faculty to concentrate on in-house commitments. As a result, only two of the faculty projects could be completed. Nevertheless, Year Three produced a conceptual model of faculty collaboration (Carson, Chase, & Gibson, 1993) based on participating faculty's responses to a survey that questioned them about their experiences with the project. In addition, we also stressed broader dissemination of project findings including sponsoring a half-day conference at the university to share project findings, presenting project papers at national professional conferences, submitting articles to professional journals, and printing multiple copies of the conceptual model of faculty collaboration for dissemination to a wider audience.

Project Overview

"Academic Demands of the Undergraduate Curriculum: What Students Need" began as a pilot research study to examine the literacy demands of an introductory American History class at an urban university. This study, which was funded by a research grant from Georgia State University (GSU) in 1989, was the first step in the three-year project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). This larger project, funded by FIPSE (1990-1993), used information on the literacy demands of selected high-attrition undergraduate courses and comparable high school courses as the basis for a collaboration between high school and university faculty. Academic literacy thus served as the foundation for a college/school partnership that helped faculty from both institutions to understand better the literacy demands of selected courses in their curricula. The ultimate goal of the partnership was to discover and discuss ways of easing students' transition from high school to college, and in this way to positively affect student retention rates at the university.

The focus of Year One of the project was on data collection in four disciplines: biology, freshman composition, history, and political science. Research activities in Year One included the development of data collection procedures and instruments, the collection of data at the university and high school, and the analysis of these data. Data on literacy demands were collected using student pre- and post-surveys, faculty interviews, student interviews, and observation, and course artifacts (e.g., syllabus, texts, and tests).

The primary focus of Year Two was the development and implementation of a series of faculty dialogues between university and high school faculty. The faculty dialogues were conducted with two purposes in mind. First, the dialogues would serve as a way to report the findings of the literacy analyses of courses from both institutions to participating faculty consultants. Second, participating faculty from the high school and university would be brought

together to discuss the implications of these findings for developing individual or collaborative projects related to easing the transition of students from high school to university course work.

The analysis of literacy demands of courses from the two institutions served as the foundation of the faculty dialogues. It became clear that what could be viewed as a limitation of the literacy analyses, namely their lack of generalizability to other institutions, in the context of the faculty dialogues became a strength. As the source of the discussions between high school and university faculty, the specificity of the descriptions became a catalyst for partnerships that developed within the group.

In the third year of the project, the goals then became three-fold: (1) to implement projects that had been planned by the faculty consultants during Year Two; (2) to develop a conceptual model of faculty collaboration based on academic literacy descriptions; and (3) to disseminate the findings of the project to local and national audiences. Although obstacles arose to completing all of the planned projects (the **first goal**), a workshop led by the university English professor for high school English teachers was conducted, and another project, which involved university faculty and students, was successfully implemented in a university Developmental Studies reading class. The success of the faculty dialogues led to the **second goal** for Year Three: to develop a conceptual model of faculty collaboration based on discussions of academic literacy. Faculty who had participated in the faculty dialogues were surveyed about their experiences with the project in order to identify the aspects of the collaboration that had been essential to its success. The project co-directors used the results of this survey to develop a model for faculty collaboration that could be easily replicated in a variety of settings. The **third goal**, dissemination, was met in various ways including: (a) sponsoring a project-based conference titled "Preparing Students for College: Making the Transition" for local college and high school faculty and administrators; (b) presentations to local and national audiences; (c)

papers submitted to professional journals, and (d) direct mailing of project-sponsored publications to relevant administrators, educators, and researchers.

Thus, this project on academic literacy of the undergraduate curriculum has primarily served teachers, especially those faculty involved in high school to college bridge programs--secondary-level teachers, university faculty in transition programs (Developmental Studies, English as a Second Language, and Learning Assistance) and lower-division university faculty. The principal outcomes of the project are:

1) Descriptions of the academic literacy requirements of selected high-demand, lower-division university courses and comparable courses at a local public high school;

2) Successful collaboration of secondary and college faculty that focused on helping students develop academic literacy skills and successfully managing academic literacy requirements of undergraduate courses;

3) Information on academic literacy requirements provided to bridge program faculty which has served to inform instruction and stimulate curriculum modification; and

4) Development of a conceptual model of faculty collaboration based on descriptions and discussions of academic literacy requirements, and the dissemination of this model to a wider audience.

Purpose

The problem that this project addressed was student access and retention. In particular, the project focused on the issues of helping students make a successful transition to university coursework, and the role that academic literacy skills play in student success.

Student access and retention has been identified as a problem relatively recently. Although access to higher education during the last 25 years has become a reality for a wide range of students, retention of these students remains a problem. In response to this problem,

varied developmental education, learning assistance, and English-as-a-second language (ESL) programs have been established in numerous colleges. Universities nationwide are concerned about retention of students identified as marginal academically, as well as non-marginal students for whom the freshman year is especially difficult. Minority students are of special concern since, according to the American Council on Education, in 1989 African Americans representing 9.2% of the undergraduate population earned only 5.7% of the bachelor's degrees (Blake, 1990).

At issue is how to ease students' transition from high school to college by maximizing the instructional effectiveness of academic preparation programs on both the secondary and postsecondary level. At best, many preparation programs develop curricula based upon speculations of what generic academic skills students must know to perform successfully in college classrooms (Jackson, 1978; Brittain & Brittain, 1982). Although the College Board (1983) has outlined what college entrants need to know and to be able to do, these descriptions are inadequate because they are too general to inform the process of developing curricula which would help students progress from high school to college academics. The College Board, in fact, explicitly states that "no attempt has been made to define the level of difficulty or the degree of sophistication that any one school or college should expect of its students" (p. 4). A recent study examining the language use in lower-division academic courses (Anderson, Best, Black, Hurst, Miller & Miller, 1990) noted that language process and learning at the freshman level differs from the language process and learning students receive in their preparation courses (p.11).

Research has shown that for underprepared students the rigorous courses of the college core curriculum are among the primary causes of academic failure and attrition and that underprepared students benefit most from instruction in academic tasks resembling the reading and writing demands which will be expected of them in actual college and university coursework (Feathers & Smith, 1983; Nist & Kirby, 1986). We reasoned that if college

preparation programs, whether in high schools or within universities themselves, are to best serve the needs of both students and the academic community, these programs must be tied directly to the content and practices of a university curriculum. We reasoned further that it is important to describe the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in university-level academic courses and of students at the secondary level so that the faculty at both levels can be aware of the similarities and differences in these expectations. These academic literacy descriptions could then serve as a foundation for collaboration of secondary and postsecondary faculties in easing the transition of high school students to the university. Through such collaboration the faculty of preparation institutions or programs would then be able to make curricular modifications that should result in better preparation programs and, ultimately, in better retention rates for at-risk students.

Our original purpose was thus to describe the literacy demands of selected courses at both the high school and university and to bring together faculty from the two institutions to plan projects--some involving curriculum modification--to facilitate the transition of students into university coursework. Careful attention was paid to the planning of the faculty dialogues in Year Two to achieve these goals. An initial concern of the co-principal investigators during the planning phase had been that differences in background and perceived differences in status in the faculties from the two institutions might impede the discussion and the development of productive working relationships. In spite of these real and perceived differences in academic background and status, relationships among the two faculties developed successfully, good discussion ensued, and the atmosphere of the workshops suggested that promising cross-institutional relationships of this type could be established. The model of faculty interaction based on a discussion of academic literacy is one of the outcomes of these discussions.

The description of academic literacy requirements is at the heart of this project; however, our understanding of the value of this description has changed somewhat. Initially, we had thought that these academic literacy descriptions would be the principal outcome of the project, available for dissemination to a wide audience. In fact, these descriptions have led us, as researchers, to a general understanding of how academic literacy is understood and practiced by students and faculty (see Carson, Chase, Gibson, & Hargrove, 1992). However, their real value lies in their specificity and immediacy in the context of subsequent faculty discussions. The model of faculty collaboration that is the principal result of this project centers on a modified version of these data/descriptions which are not only the starting points, but also the primary focus of subsequent academic alliances/faculty collaborations.

Background and Origins

Considering the generality of most descriptions of academic literacy demands in the college undergraduate curriculum (e.g., College Board, 1983), we undertook this project in order to describe in greater depth and with more specificity the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in university-level academic courses. In addition, we wanted to compare and contrast academic literacy demands in selected high school and entry-level university courses in order to illustrate the progression from one academic level to the next, thus ensuring that our descriptions would be accurate and ultimately informative for curriculum development in preparation programs on both the high school and university level.

As faculty in university programs (developmental studies, learning assistance, applied linguistics/ESL) devoted to preparing marginally admitted or struggling students for university coursework, we piloted our data collection instruments and methods prior to FIPSE funding in a university undergraduate history course. This course was deemed "high demand" because so many students fail to complete the course with a C or better. Our pilot study was funded by our

individual departments, and an internal university research grants award. With these initial findings and subsequent funding from FIPSE, we refined instruments and collection methods and expanded our project to include three other courses (biology, English composition, and political science), in addition to the history course that had been the focus of our pilot study.

The four high-demand entry-level university courses were selected for this investigation because they are included as part of the coursework needed to fulfill the B.A. and the B.S. degree requirements, and because students find them relatively difficult. Upon completion of the study, it was found that only 54% of Biology 141 students, 58% of English 111 students, 77% of History 113 students, and 78% of Political Science 101 students, passed the class with a C average or better.

This research project was conducted at an urban, public university and a nearby city high school. University enrollment for Fall quarter 1990 was 23,386, including 15,532 undergraduates and an additional 933 marginally admitted developmental studies students. This urban university is a non-residential campus and enrollment is drawn heavily from the metropolitan area. Thus, the academic literacy descriptions of specific courses at this university are of interest to teachers from a number of metropolitan schools whose students are likely to enroll here.

Twenty-four percent of students at the university are self-declared minorities, including African Americans (17%), Asians (5%), and Hispanics (2%). The composite SAT mean score for 1,091 regularly admitted freshmen in Fall 1990 was 974. The composite SAT mean score for the 933 developmental studies students was 797. The one-year retention rate for Fall 1989 through Fall 1990 was 68% for regular students and 65% for developmental studies students, with a combined retention rate of 66.9%.

The high school involved in this project is one of the city's public schools with an enrollment of approximately 750 students, predominantly African-American. The courses selected for

investigation were chosen to be comparable in discipline and content to the selected university courses. The high school courses studied were Biology, English, American History, and Political Behavior.

The greatest problem we encountered in conducting this project in the two academic settings was in sustaining a cooperative relationship with the high school administration. Faculty from both academic settings maintained an interest in the project, first indicated by their ongoing assistance in data collection and then by their enthusiastic participation in a series of cross-institutional faculty dialogues. In the project's third year, in spite of clearance for our project from the city's School Board, the high school principal discouraged her faculty from participating further in the project because she wanted their time to be spent on in-house activities and committees. She also canceled several other projects involving relationships between the school and the surrounding community, including a vocationally-oriented program enabling students to visit and study local businesses. We learned from this experience that the support of the principal and other top school administrators is essential to the longevity of such a cross-institutional relationship, even when rapport with involved faculty is positive and collaborative. We also learned that such administrative support is extremely difficult to negotiate and sustain.

We learned, too, that school systems tend to have a top-down administration compared with the university's more participatory style. In fact, we received enthusiastic support from university faculty, department chairs and deans throughout this project with few, if any, complications in maintaining university faculty participation. It is important to note, however, that senior university faculty at the associate and full professor rank participated in this project which was oriented to issues related to teaching and curriculum development. To be able to focus on the process of teaching in the university may be a luxury confined to older faculty who

are not under as much intense pressure as younger faculty who are facing tenure and promotion standards emphasizing research and publishing.

Project Description

Year One of this project was spent collecting and analyzing data to compile descriptions of the academic literacy activities in the selected university and high school courses. Year Two of this project was spent planning and conducting a series of cross-institutional faculty dialogues. The academic literacy descriptions were discussed in these meetings, and served as a basis for participating faculty to develop curricular activities and related projects for easing students' transition from high school to college academics. We intended that Year Three of the project be spent implementing the projects and activities developed by the high school and university faculty. Because the principal was unwilling to continue to support these endeavors, only two of the activities developed during the faculty dialogues were implemented, both of which were carried out by university professors. Despite these aborted plans, Year Three was spent developing a model of faculty collaboration for possible replication in a variety of settings. The impetus for developing this model was the success of the Year Two faculty dialogues. Year Three also focused on disseminating project findings to local and national audiences affiliated with both secondary and postsecondary education.

Year One: Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected from two sections each of the four targeted university courses. Surveys were administered to students in eight intact university classes in the four selected disciplines at the beginning and end of one academic quarter. These surveys required students to identify expectations and eventual outcomes regarding course content, requirements, reading and writing demands, and the difficulties they experienced fulfilling course demands. [See Appendix 1 for examples of survey instruments.] Eight students were interviewed from each

course about their experience in the course. Interviews were conducted with (1) two students performing successfully in the course, (2) two students not performing successfully in the course, (3) two former developmental studies students, and (4) two English-as-second-language students. Professors teaching these courses were also interviewed. Interviews were taped and later transcribed. [See Appendix 2 for sample interview questions.] Trained observers also attended the classes weekly and recorded specific reading, writing, and verbal activity happening in the class. [See Appendix 3 for the observation manual.] Finally, all course artifacts were collected for each section of the four disciplines. These artifacts included all texts assigned, syllabuses, tests, exams, and sample assignments from students.

Similar data collection was carried out in the four targeted high school courses: student surveys at the end of the academic term, interviews with four students and the teacher in each course, weekly observations, and collected course artifacts.

Data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Response percentages were compiled from surveys and observation data, and themes emerged in the analyses of interviews. Categories were established to describe course artifacts, e.g., number of pages assigned, nature of exam questions, types of writing tasks (Carson et al., 1992).

Year Two: Faculty Dialogues

At the beginning of the second year, we were informed that the high school principal, with whom we had originally negotiated a three-year partnership, had been transferred to another school. The incoming principal was less enthusiastic about sustaining the school-university partnership and was concerned that because of the previous principal's approval of the project, we had not been required initially to seek approval for research by the city's School Board. The incoming principal asked us to gain the approval of the city's School Board Research Committee before proceeding further. We then wrote a proposal describing and justifying the

existing three-year investigation of academic literacy demands and submitted it to the committee. Approval was granted, but execution continued to require the principal's cooperation. The principal agreed to support faculty in attending meetings immediately after school and in working with the university on this project.

Cross-institutional faculty dialogues were planned carefully to ensure as much as possible that positive collaborative relationships would develop between university and high school faculty. To this end, we presented descriptions of the academic literacy analyses separately to university and high school faculty in the first meetings so that each group could become familiar with these descriptions before meeting with faculty from the other institution. This approach was intended to reduce the anxiety and possible competition between the two groups. Once familiar with the academic literacy descriptions of their own and the other institution, three meetings over a three- month period were held at the university, bringing together the four high school faculty and the four university faculty to begin discussion of the ways student transition could be facilitated across the two academic levels.

Care was taken to provide a formal, but comfortable atmosphere for these meetings, and even seating arrangements were planned so as to maximize the interaction of discipline-specific faculty from both institutions. All participants received notebooks containing the complete literacy descriptions across disciplines and institutions. Agendas were distributed for each meeting, and minutes were recorded from audio tapes and notes of each session which were then distributed to all participants. During the interim between formal meetings, telephone contact was made regularly among faculty participants, and with one of the three FIPSE project co-directors. Faculty participants were asked to write statements of reaction to the literacy analyses, and to develop written descriptions of a specific curricular project or activity they intended to implement during the next year. Secretarial support was offered to all participants,

and copies of project ideas were distributed. Finally, faculty participants were asked to evaluate the series of dialogues in terms of the benefits they had gained in the cross-institutional interactions.

Year Three: Dissemination

Efforts were made at the beginning of the third year to sustain the partnership with the high school through letters and phone calls to the principal and faculty. The principal was unwilling for the high school faculty to continue any visits to the university or to implement the activities they had developed to ease students into university academic coursework.

In light of the breakdown of this partnership at the administrative level, our energies turned to other project goals. **First**, we wanted to assist two university professors in implementing their projects. One of the projects involved a political science professor teaching several developmental studies reading classes so students would experience an actual university professor instructing the material of his discipline. The other project involved an English professor meeting with the high school language arts faculty to discuss the requirements of freshmen composition in the university. (This project had actually been conducted at the end of year two before the breakdown of the high school-university relationship.) **Second**, we wanted to develop a conceptual model of faculty collaboration based on our experiences with the faculty dialogues in year two. Faculty who had participated in the faculty dialogues were surveyed about their experiences with the project in order to identify the aspects of the collaboration that had been essential to its success. Because replicating the entire project would not be financially feasible, the model contains the crucial aspects of the faculty collaboration as identified by the faculty and the project co-directors. The result was a model that could be easily replicated in a variety of settings (Carson et al., 1993).

Third, we also stressed broader dissemination of project findings, with dissemination efforts taking three directions during year three. We hosted a half-day conference at the university titled "Preparing Students for College: Making the Transition" and invited metro-area college, developmental studies, ESL, learning assistance, and high school faculty, counselors, and administrators. In addition to presentations by each of the FIPSE project co-directors and break-out discussion groups, Dr. Sherrie Nist from The University of Georgia was invited to speak on research on academic literacy and future directions for pursuing this area of investigation.

Another direction for dissemination was to present findings from the project at national professional conferences, and to submit articles for publication in professional journals [See Appendix 4]. Finally, we printed multiple copies of the conceptual model of faculty collaboration (Carson et al., 199) for dissemination to a wider audience.

Evaluation/Project Reports

The project had two principal components: 1) the description of academic literacy demands that was completed in Year One, and 2) the faculty collaboration activities that took place in Year Two. These two components can be understood as having both local as well as more global effects.

Academic Literacy Descriptions. Most specifically the academic literacy descriptions had a significant effect upon the high school and university faculty whose courses were targeted by the project and who were subsequently asked to participate in the faculty dialogues. These faculty had the opportunity to gain valuable information about their own courses and about students' perceptions of various course demands. In addition, faculty were provided with information about the requirements of the course that served as the disciplinary interface at the alternate institution, and were given the opportunity to engage in discussions about issues affecting the development of academic literacy skills across institutions. As a result of their

discussions over the course of the dialogues, faculty participants planned to implement various projects that would serve to better prepare students for postsecondary academic literacy tasks.

Although faculty for the most part were unable to carry out these projects due to the institutional difficulties discussed earlier, the project ideas themselves are evidence of the success of the dialogues, demonstrating the faculty's heightened awareness of the ways in which students can be helped in developing academic literacy skills. Furthermore, faculty evaluations of the faculty dialogues were unanimously positive.

In addition to the secondary and postsecondary faculty directly involved in the project, additional academic preparation units at Georgia State University have benefitted from the information contained in the description of academic literacy requirements. In the English-as-a-Second-Language program, curriculum revisions are currently being instituted to make ESL preparation more responsive to the specific requirements of undergraduate courses at GSU as defined by the project descriptions. Faculty in the ESL program have also used the information provided in the descriptions to initiate discussions with the English Department about the possibility of offering special sections of ESL freshman composition. In Developmental Studies two projects are underway involving curricular revisions that are aimed at enabling students to more directly experience academic demands similar to the ones they will experience in regular academic courses. One project involves teaching students the procedures of debating so as to learn the process of supporting assertions through library research. The second project involves offering a developmental study strategy course as adjunct to the regular American History course. And in the Learning Assistance Center, plans are underway to incorporate information derived from this project into a new course targeting students on academic warning, probation, and suspension.

Besides directly affecting faculty at the institutional site of the data collection, the academic literacy descriptions have also proved valuable to faculty of academic preparation programs whose students will be attending Georgia State University. At the conference "Preparing Students for College: Making the Transition" (May, 1993), participants drawn from across the metropolitan area were provided with copies of the academic literacy descriptions, as well as the opportunity to discuss the implications of these data for their own institutions. Participants found this information quite useful, rating the high school descriptions at 3.8 (on a 5 point scale) and the university descriptions as 3.9.

Finally, in spite of the limited generalizability of the academic literacy descriptions that were specific to the institutions involved, the project directors gave a number of presentations at national, state, and local conferences in which they discussed the findings of the data collection and analysis phase of the project and their implications for academic preparation units. [See Appendix 4 for a list of these presentations]. In addition, an article was published in Reading Research and Instruction on this topic, and three other manuscripts based on these descriptions are currently under review. Acceptance of conference presentations and scholarly articles constitutes positive evaluation of this component of the project.

Model of Faculty Collaboration. The second principal component of the project was the series of faculty dialogues that took place in Year Two and the resulting conceptual model of faculty collaboration that emerged from those dialogues. Because we had become convinced in Year One of the lack of generalizability of the academic literacy descriptions that had resulted from the data collection and analysis, we turned our attention in Year Two to developing a replicable model of faculty collaboration in which the principal focus would be academic literacy. The model that emerged is the result of the faculty participants' evaluations of their own

experiences with the faculty dialogues in which they discussed the academic literacy descriptions and their curricular implications (Carson et al., 1992).

Although the model itself is the evaluation of the faculty collaboration process as experienced by the participants, the value of the model depends on whether or not it proves to be truly replicable in a variety of settings. Jill Triplett, Research Associate and coordinator of academic alliance programs at the Southern Regional Education Board [SREB] in Atlanta, has requested that we provide her with 170 copies of the final model so that she can send them to academic alliance contacts in the 15-state SREB area. Because the model was developed in Year Three of the FIPSE project, it has yet to be field tested, and this testing will depend, in part, on how well the model is disseminated.

At the national level, we have submitted a proposal to present the Faculty Collaboration Model to the AAHE's Conference on College/School Partnerships to be held in Pittsburgh in December, 1993. Proposal acceptances will be announced in August, and acceptance will constitute a positive evaluation of the component of the project.

Finally, external evaluators have provided valuable feedback to the project. Dr. Norm Stahl (Year One), Dr. Robert Gundlach (Year Two), and Dr. Philo Hutcheson (Year Three) have each written detailed evaluation reports.

Plans for Continuation And Dissemination. Plans for continuation and dissemination at Georgia State University focus specifically on curriculum revisions based on the academic literacy descriptions, and these ongoing activities have already been discussed.

Project personnel have also written articles based on the academic literacy descriptions and there are currently three such articles under review. In addition, the Fall/Winter issue of the Georgia Journal of Reading will include two articles from the project-sponsored May conference. Additional scholarly articles are planned using the FIPSE database, and we

anticipate the possibility of having the Faculty Collaboration Model included in the AAHE's publication of conference proceedings of the Conference on College/School Partnerships. Finally, we have printed and have available for distribution multiple copies of the two principal FIPSE-sponsored publications: (1) Literacy Analyses of High School and University Courses: Summary Descriptions of Selected Courses, and (2) A Model for Faculty Collaboration: Focus on Academic Literacy (Carson et al., 1993). We have already distributed over 100 of the first publication to faculty and administrators of academic preparation programs in the metropolitan Atlanta area, as well as to colleagues and researchers interested in academic literacy. In addition to the 170 copies of the second publication that will be mailed to the SREB contacts, as well as the copies that will be distributed at the AAHE conference on School/College Partnerships, we expect to receive a number of requests from other educators, administrators, and researchers interested in faculty collaborations.

Summary and Conclusions

In summary, this project on academic literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum began with a relatively sophisticated notion of how these demands might be described and with a primary focus on that description. Our goal had been to present these descriptions of undergraduate courses to academic preparation units as a goal towards which these units might direct their curricula. However, the necessary specificity of the academic literacy descriptions generated by the project limited their generalizability for any application purposes beyond the institutions in which they had been observed. Nevertheless, this specificity became the most significant factor in the success of the subsequent collaboration, focusing the faculty discussions on the actual requirements and point of need for students in **their** courses. As one faculty participant noted, "programs for abstract improvement of education usually deflect time and

energy away from teaching;" that is, the strength of the collaboration was in its specific and concrete focus.

Because of the success of the faculty dialogues, it became clear that what was generalizable from the project was a model of faculty collaboration based on academic literacy descriptions of courses taught by the faculty in a specific collaboration. This focus on academic literacy is important for several reasons.

First, the development of academic literacy is a central concern of faculty in both academic preparation and university settings. As such, it provides a natural mutually agreed-upon starting point for discussion.

Second, it invites collaboration that includes faculty of transition or bridge programs such as developmental studies or English-as-a-second-language programs, faculty who are typically excluded from collaborative activities that are based on disciplinary knowledge.

Third, the focus on developing skills that underlie academic success, as opposed to a focus on specific disciplinary content, allows instructors of all levels to participate in the collaborative process. Understanding academic literacy skills from a developmental perspective means that even teachers of high school freshman courses can participate in faculty dialogues.

Fourth, knowing what students have experienced in specific academic preparation classes and what they will experience in specific university classes allows faculty a clear picture of the interface between the two, a clear focus for discussion, and a coherent basis for instituting changes.

Finally, the fact that the focus is on developing students' abilities provides a certain balance of power between university and high school teachers. In this collaboration faculty from both settings develop a sense of joint responsibility for helping students

make the transition from high school to university work. Together they constitute a kind of "meta-institution" in which they recognize that their shared work has implications that are broader than those that extend only to their individual classrooms.

Fife (1991) notes that "the quality of collegiate education is influenced by the quality of high school education and vice versa. The future of each is dependent on the performance of the other" (p. xv). This interdependence also holds between colleges and other types of academic preparation programs, and implies that faculty collaborations of the type we have been exploring would have the faculty "acting out of mutual, enlightened self-interest" (Albert, 1991, p. 1). What we have found in the course of this project is that faculty at all levels are very much committed to engaging in discussions with like-minded faculty to explore ways of helping students successfully manage the academic literacy requirements of the undergraduate curriculum.

References

Albert, L. S. (1991). Introduction and overview of the partnership movement. In F. P. Wilbur & L. M. Lambert (Eds.), Linking America's schools and colleges: Guide to partnerships & national directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1-4.

Anderson, W., Best, C., Black, A., Hurst, J., Miller, B., & Miller, S. (1990). Cross-curricular underlife: A collaborative report on ways with academic words. College Composition and Communication, 41, 11-36.

Blake, J. (1990, February 4). As minority enrollment declines, colleges step up recruiting efforts. Atlanta Journal and Constitution, D-12.

Brittain, M. M., & Brittain, C. V. (1982). Means of assessing remedial reading needs of college students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 222-871)

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1992). Literacy analyses of high school and university courses: Summary descriptions of selected courses. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993). A model for faculty collaboration: focus on academic literacy. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

Carson, J. G., Chase N. D., Gibson, S. U., & Hargrove, M. (1992). Literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum. Reading Research and Instruction, 31, 25-50.

College Board. (1983). Academic preparation for college: What students need to know and be able to do. New York: The College Board.

Feathers, K. M., & Smith, F. R. (1983). The evaluation of a research design: A case study in content reading. Reading Psychology, 4, 179-187.

Fife, J. D. (1991). Foreword. In A. R. Greenberg (Ed.), High school-college partnerships: Conceptual models, programs, and issues. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development, xv-xvi.

Jackson, J. E. (1978). College reading programs of today? Who? What? Where? (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 208-349)

Nist, S. L., & Kirby, K. (1986) Teaching comprehension and study strategies through modeling and thinking aloud. Reading Research and Instruction, 25, 254-264.

APPENDIX 1

SAMPLE SURVEY QUESTIONS

Appendix 1 body:

same as App 1 body

Long version

APPENDIX 2

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

FACULTY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. As faculty in the History department, what would you like us in Developmental Studies, in ESL, and in the Learning Assistance Center to know that would help us better prepare students for your course? What would you like students to have learned in high school?

2. How would you characterize student backgrounds and preparation for this course, both academic and non-academic?

3. What kinds of attitudes do students bring to this course?

4. Do you think students have realistic expectations about the course in terms of course content and requirements? Why or why not?

5. How would you characterize student achievements in this course? What can they do, or what have they typically learned by the end of the term?

6. What seem to be the sources of student difficulties with the course? With reading? With writing? With test taking?

7. Do you think students read the texts or do they get by on lectures?

8. When looking at the grade distribution, what seems to characterize the work of A students? B? C? D? F?

9. In what ways does your knowledge/expectations about students help you structure your class? Lectures, assignments, tests?

10. In terms of general course requirements, what do you want students to know and what do you expect them to be able to do with that knowledge?

11. What do you expect that students will have to do to acquire the information that you want them to acquire? In other words, what skills do you think are most essential for success in this discipline?

12. If you had to choose the three most important topics that you want students to have learned in this course, what would they be?

13. What do you want your students to know, or have a sense of, upon completion of your course?

STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (History)

1. You are finishing an introductory course in history. Was it what you expected it to be in terms of content? Assignments? Exams?

2. What have been your strengths in this course? (What did you do well? What were you good at?).

3. What have been your weaknesses in this course? (What was difficult for you? Where did you have problems?).

4. What does the instructor expect of you in this course? What does s/he want you to know/want to teach you? To be able to do?

5. Was it easy for you to figure out what the instructor wanted. Why or why not?

6. What would you like your high school teachers (D.S./ESL) to have taught you that would have helped you in this course?

7. Did you have any problems with language in this course? In reading? Writing? Studying? Understanding lectures?

8. What did you do to get ready for exams? What materials/techniques did you use and how did you study? Was it enough? Why or why not?

9. What do you know now about history that has become clear to you as a result of taking this course? (We're after a general notion her, corresponds to faculty interview question 13).

10. Have you liked/been interested in what you're learning? Why or why not?

11. Are reading and writing in college different from reading and writing in high school? If so, how?

12. Are reading and writing in school different from reading and writing outside of school?

13. Are there any classes that you feel helped prepare you for this class--either for what you had to learn or for what you had to do (assignments, tests, etc.)?

14. What advice would you give someone who is thinking about taking this class next quarter?

15. I'd like some additional background information.

- Where did you go to high school?
- What prompted you to come to this university?
- Why are you taking this course?
- Tell me about your parents education
- How many hours a week do you work?
- Do you have any family responsibilities?

FACULTY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. In your opinion, what makes a good high school teacher?

2. How would you characterize student backgrounds and preparation for this course, both academic and non-academic?

3. What kinds of attitudes do students bring to this course?

4. Do you think students have realistic expectations about the course in terms of course content and requirements? Why or why not?

5. How would you characterize student achievements in this course? What can they do, or what have they typically learned by the end of the term?

6. What seem to be the sources of student difficulties with the course? With reading? With writing? With test taking?

7. Do you think students read the texts or do they get by just listening to what you say in class?

8. When looking at the grade distribution, what seems to characterize the work of A students? B? C? D? F?

9. In what ways does your knowledge/expectations about students help you structure your class? Homework? Lectures? Assignments? Tests?

10. In terms of general course requirements, what do you want students to know and what do you expect them to be able to do with that knowledge?

11. What do you expect that students will have to do to acquire the information that you want them to acquire? In other words, what skills do you think are most essential for success in this discipline?

12. If you had to choose the three most important topics that you want students to have learned in this course, what would they be?

13. What do you want your students to know, or have a sense of, upon completion of your course?

14. What are the general goals of the course? Fulfill high school requirements? Provide content? Prepare students for post-secondary education? Anything else?

15. What do you think students need to know/to be able to do in order to succeed in college-level history classes?

16. Of these areas that you have just outlined for me, how much are they able to accomplish in this course?

17. Of the students enrolled in this class, how many do you think will go on to a college or university

18. What kinds of students do you predict would be successful in college? What is the best way for HS students to prepare themselves for college?

STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. You are finishing an introductory course in history. Was it what you expected it to be in terms of content? Assignments? Exams?

2. What have been your strengths in this course? (What did you do well? What were you good at?)

3. What have been your weaknesses in this course? (What was difficult for you? Where did you have problems?)

4. What does the teacher expect of you in this course? What does s/he want you to know/want to teach you? To be able to do?

5. Was it easy for you to figure out what the teacher wanted? Why or why not?

6. What would you like to be able to do that would have helped you in this course?

7. Did you have any problems with language in this course? In reading? Writing? Studying? Understanding what the teacher was talking about?

8. How much time do you spend studying/doing homework for this class? How much of that time is after school?

9. What did you do to get ready for tests? What materials/ techniques did you use and how did you study? Was it enough? Why or why not?

10. What do you think are some of the most important things about history that you've learned in this class?

11. Have you liked/been interested in what you're learning? Why or why not?

12. Are reading and writing in high school different from reading and writing in elementary school? If so, how?

13. Are reading and writing in school different from reading and writing outside of school? If so, how?

14. Are there any classes that you've taken that you feel helped prepare you for this class--either for what you had to learn or for what you had to do (assignments, tests, etc.)?

15. What advice would you give someone who was going to take this class next year?

16. What are your plans after you graduate from high school?

17. If you decide to go to college, do you feel that you would do well in a history class? What do you think you would need to know/be able to do to do well in a college-level history class?

18. I'd like some additional background information. Could you tell me:
    a) How many hours a week do you work?
    b) Do you have any family responsibilities?
    c) Tell me about your parents' education.

APPENDIX 3

OBSERVATION MANUAL

HANDBOOK FOR FIPSE PROJECT DATA COLLECTORS

I. Purpose Statement

The ultimate goal of this project is to enable academic preparation programs (high school, developmental studies, ESL, and learning assistance centers) to more adequately prepare students for the demands of university courses by developing curricula based on the actual literacy requirements of those courses. The purpose of the project data collection, then, is to identify the literacy demands of academic courses in such a way that a description of these demands can be utilized by instructors in academic preparation programs.

1. **Explicit Literacy Demands.** The data that contribute to this description come from several sources. Most prominent are the data collected from classroom observations. These observations are the richest source of information about the kinds of literacy demands that students face. They focus on classroom uses of, and underlying assumptions about, the reading and writing that students do and have been asked to do. Discussions (or questions and answers), which are prototypical oral language events, for example, are not literacy events in the narrowest sense, but because they frequently assume background reading or are a prelude to a reading/writing assignment, they do constitute a literacy demand in the broadest sense. Listening to lectures is a literacy event, as well, (a) because it requires students to listen to and comprehend academic language for notetaking purposes, (b) because of the notetaking that students do in response to the lecture, (c) because the notes themselves constitute one of the primary texts that students read (exam preparation, e.g.), and (d) because lectures are always related in some way to the reading that students have done or will do. A related data source are all the textual artifacts from the course: syllabi, handouts, exams, books, papers, etc.

2. **Implicit Literacy Demands.** These data taken together--the observations and the textual artifacts--provide a relatively explicit description of the academic literacy requirements of the course, but there are implicit demands, as well. These implicit demands are those that the instructor places on students, his/her expectations of what constitutes an adequate response to the explicit literacy demands. This information is determined in two ways. First, by collecting copies of students' evaluated work, assignments and exams, we
are able to see the way that instructors evaluate that work. A student is expected to write an essay exam, for example (an explicit demand), but an adequate essay (one that receives a satisfactory grade) is one that gives evidence of "X" level of knowledge and/or one written at "X" level of writing proficiency (an implicit demand). In addition to collecting this work, we conduct instructor interviews as another window on implicit literacy demands. These interviews are used to elicit the instructor's design for the

course, a design that is based on the instructor's perceptions of students' abilities and expectations, as well as on his/her sense of what constitutes the relevant course content.

3. **Student Response to Literacy Demands.** A final piece of the data collection entails student response to the explicit and implicit demands. This reponse is measured by the pre-and post survey as well as by student interviews. These data provide crucial information about the ways in which literacy demands are understood and managed, and about students' perceptions of what constitutes adequate preparation for academic coursework.

II. Interaction With Participants

A. Purpose
1. To facilitate cooperation and a pleasant experience for both the observer and the instructor being observed.
2. To help the observer interact with students in an appropriate manner.

B. Initial Contact with the Instructor
1. Project directors are responsible for initial contact with the instructors for the project.
2. The Project Director will explain the objectives and basic procedures to the instructor. You need to introduce yourself to the instructor and coordinate the first day procedures to the satisfaction of both you and the instructor.

NOTE: The instructor of the class will have received a packet of materials from the project director. This packet will include a letter thanking the instructor for his/her participation as well as the instruments used in the project - surveys, observation guidelines and interview questions for both the instructor and the students. If the instructor has not received any of these materials by the time of the first meeting with you, contact the project manager so these materials can be given to the instructor.

*3. **Make contact before the first date of class.**
4. The initial contact can be made by a visit or telephone call to the instructor. A visit is preferable if time allows so that the instructor will recognize you on the first day of class.
5. The first contact with the instructor should be "short", sweet, and to the point".

NOTE: Keep in mind that a new instructor or a GTA may feel uncomfortable initially with an observer in his/her classroom. The observer needs to help any instructor feel at ease about the observer's presence in the classroom by explaining that he/she is not being evaluated.

Example: Introduce yourself to Professor Jones as the observer for the Project.

** Remind Professor Jones that you will give the survey before the syllabus is distributed at the beginning of the first class and that it will take approximately 30 minutes to administer. Confirm with the instructor the number of students registered for the class.

Ask if Professor Jones has any further questions.
Thank Professor Jones for coooperating.
Leave.

C. The Continuing Relationship with the Instructor.

1. An open and well-defined relationship with the professor is important to the project.
2. Not disturbing the rhythm of instruction, and being punctual and consistent are the best ways to assure the instructor that the observations will not deter from his/her presentation of materials.
3. The most important things for you to remember are:
   a) everything that you see and hear must remain confidential;
   b) it is the instructor's class; and
   c) evaluation of the instructor is not part of the observation process.

D. Initial Contact with the Students

1. Your first contact with the students will be when the survey is administered.
2. An encouraging attitude when you introduce yourself and give the instructions for the survey will increase student cooperation with the survey.

E. The Continuing Relationship with Students.

1. Students may be curious about you and the observations. They may communicate their opinions about the instructor and the course informally. This information is not part of the observations.
2. When students ask your opinion about the course and/or the instructor, be careful not to make comments that could be construed as judgmental. A relationship with the students can be established without commenting on the instructor or the class.

   NOTE: Students may begin to wave or speak to you on campus. If you are in a large class, you may not recognize the students. Be sure to answer greetings on campus. This step may seem small, but you may contact one of these students for an interview. Your response to his/her wave or smile may be the difference between consent and refusal.

III. The First Day of Class

A. Purpose

1. To solicit information from the students about their academic preparation for the course.
2. To solicit information from the students about their expectations about the course.
3. To gain the students' consent for participation in the student interviews.
4. To gather information prior to the course for comparison with information gathered in the post-survey at the end of the course.

B. Procedures

1. Double check the number of surveys and Opscan sheets before going to the class.
2. Take enough sharpened No. 2 pencils for the entire class.
3. **Remember:** the survey is given before the course introduction and before the syllabus is distributed. (See Section II B "Initial Contact with the Instructor".)
4. Introduce yourself to the class and explain the purpose of the survey.

C. Time

1. It should only take thirty (30) minutes for the distribution, completion and collection of the survey. (In a large class you may need to ask a student or the instructor to help you distribute the surveys.)
2. Watch the time. Begin timing when the last survey is given out. When fifteen (15) minutes have passed, begin to call for the return of the surveys. The survey should not take more than twenty (20) minutes.
3. When all the surveys are collected, thank the students and the instructor for their cooperation and take a vacant seat.

D. After the Survey.

1. **DO NOT LEAVE THE CLASSROOM AFTER THE SURVEY HAS BEEN COMPLETED.** After the survey is completed begin taking observation notes. Be sure to record how much class time the survey took. Record data using a format that follows the Observation Guidelines described in Section Five (V).

NOTE: Some instructors use seating charts. Because observations are only taken once a week, you need to check with the instructor about seating charts. Make sure the seat you take is vacant on the seating chart.

IV. Collecting Classroom Material

A. Purpose
1. To discover what kinds of text materials are assigned and distributed by the instructor to the students.
2. To discover what additional printed information, beyond the text, the instructor gives the students.
3. To enable the observer to see the relationship between the lecture material and all textual materials.
4. To gather examples of work completed by the students.

B. Texts
1. It is important to get a copy of the text(s) by the first day of class. In order to purchase the text at the GSU Bookstore, ask the project secretary for the project credit
* card. If any of the texts are "professor publications," the credit card may also be used at Kinko's. If the GSU Bookstore does not have the text(s) or the professor has used another copying service, take the credit card back to the project secretary. DO NOT TRY TO USE THE CREDIT CARD OFF CAMPUS. Ask the project secretary to arrange for the book(s) to be purchased. If the observations are in a public high school classroom, the classroom teacher or the principal are the best sources for obtaining the text(s).

* C. Other Materials
1. Request that the instructor put aside any materials given to the students during the classes you do not observe.
2. Take a copy of any materials given by the instructors when you are observing (unless the instructor has requested that you not take them).
3. Collect everything given out in class. Remind the instructor to keep copies for you and arrange to go to is/her office at a convenient time to pick up the materials. This can be done at the end of the term.

* D. Work by the Students
1. If the instructor assigns an essay or a written project inside or outside of class, obtain copies of the work reflecting A,B,C,D, and F levels of work from the instructor for each graded assignment. If only credit/non-credit is given for the assignment, obtain copies of work given credit and work that did not receive credit. (If possible have the instructor explain the grading criteria and record it in a "note" with the copies of the samples).

* E. Collecting Material
1. Check with the instructor at the end of the term to be sure that you have copies of all the written material distributed in class, and samples of each grade assigned for all graded work.

VIII. Post Survey

A. Purpose
1. To solicit the opinion of the students about the academic demands of the course at its completion.
2. To gather data to correlate with the pre-course survey.

B. Procedures
1. Coordinate a class time with the instructor for the post-survey. Remind the instructor that this survey will take around forty-five (45) minutes.
2. Count the surveys and Opscan sheets at least twice before you go to the classroom.
3. Take enough sharpened No. 2 pencils for the entire class.
4. Explain to the students the purpose of the second survey. **NOTE:** In a large class it may be necessary to introduce yourself again.

C. Time
1. Distribution, completion and collection of the survey should only take forty-five (45) minutes. Be sure to record the time.
2. After students have had the surveys for twenty (20) minutes begin to call for them to complete the surveys. After twenty-five (25) minutes take them up.
3. Thank the students for their cooperation. Be sure to thank the instructor for his/her cooperation also.

D. After The Survey
1. Take your seat and begin to record information according to the observation guidelines. Remember to record how much class time the post-survey took.

OBSERVATION GUIDELINES

1. How is the **class structured?**
   [Note all activities and percentage of class time devoted to each.]
   - A. Instructor lecturing/talking
     (Note how lecture is structured and presented, including graphic and verbal cues. Is the organization made apparent? How?)
   - B. Student/Intructor exchange
   - C. Student/Student exchange (e.g., groupwork)
   - D. Student presentations
   - E. Other (specify)

2. What constitutes the **instructor-directed class content?**
   [Note all activities and percentage of class time devoted to each.]
   - A. Instructor lectures:
     1) Reviewing or explaining material in reading assignment.
     (Note # of times text or reading assignment is referred to in lecture.)

     2) Supplementing material in reading assignment.
     (Note relationship of material to text.)
     3) Referring to audio-visual aids.
     (Note relationship of lecture to av material.)
   - B. Instructor uses audio-visual aids.
     (Note relationship of av material to text.)
   - C. Instructor defines vocabulary, directly or indirectly.
     (Note words that are defined and strategies instructor uses.)
   - D. Instructor reviews material from homework assignment. (e.g., corrects, explains problems, etc.)
   - E. Instructor explains homework directions, gives assignments.
     (Describe assignments. Note if they also appear on syllabus.)
   - F. Intructor identifies and/or discusses topics to be covered on exam.
   - G. Instructor gets off topic.
     (Note # of times.)

3. What are the **students** being **asked to do?**
   [Note all activities and percentage of class time devoted to each.]
   - A. Takes notes.
     (Note % of students taking notes at different points in the class. Distinguish cued vs. uncued, observed randomly 3 times per class, notetaking.)
     Cued: Uncued:

   - B. Take quizzes or exams.
   - C. Participate in discussions.
     (Note topics and goals)
   - D. Do in-class reading/writing.
     (Describe)
   - E. Record assignments or directions.
   - F. Apply information assigned in or outside of class.
     (Describe, e.g., problem solving)
   - G. Answer questions.
     (Note Question #4 which requests additional information for this item)
   - H. Other.
     (Specify, e.g., attend to a-v, writing lab)

4. What kinds and numbers of questions are being asked?
[Note frequency of each type.]
A. Directed to students (by instructor).
1) related to writing or reading assignment completed outside of class.
2) related to writing or reading assignment completed in class.
3) related to lecture
4) unrelated to reading/writing/lecture.

B. Directed to instructor (by students).
1) related to writing or reading assignment completed outside of class.
2) related to writing or reading assignment completed in class.
3) related to lecture
4) unrelated to reading/writing/lecture.

5. What are oral student participation patterns like and how many students participate? (If a few students dominate discussions, please note.)
[Note frequency of each type.]
A. Instructor seeks/initiates student participation.
1) Response elicited from each student in class
2) Response elicited from some, but not all, students in class.
3) Respondant not specified; question directed at entire class
a) one student responds
b) generalized group response
4) No response. (Do not include rhetorical questions.)

B. Students volunteer/initiate participation.
1) All students contribute to class.
2) Some students contribute to class.

C. Students approach instructor before/after class.

APPENDIX 4

DISSEMINATION LIST

Academic Demands of the Undergraduate Curriculum: What Students Need
Dissemination List

PUBLICATIONS

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., Gibson, S. U., & Hargrove, M. (1992). Literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum. Reading Research Instruction, 31, (4), 25-50.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993). Academic literacy: Reading/writing tasks as problem and need. TESOL Journal (Under review).

Carson, J. G. (In preparation). Integrating academic literacy skills.

Chase, N. D., Gibson, S. U., & Carson, J. G. (1993). Reading demands in four college courses: What developmental instructors should know. Journal of Developmental Education. (Under review.)

Commander, N. E., & Gibson, S. U. (In preparation). Active learning: The role of debate in the reading classroom. To be submitted to Journal of Developmental Education.

Gibson, S. U., Carson, J. G., & Chase, N. D. (1993). Initiation into the academy: Student and faculty perceptions of an introductory college biology course. Journal of the Freshman Experience (under review).

Nist, S. (In preparation). What the literature says about academic literacy. To be submitted to the Georgia Journal of Reading.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Carson, J. G. (1990, March). Curriculum development: Discovering the academic interface for intensive courses. Paper presented at the 24th Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, CA.

Carson, J. G. (1990, April). Literacy demands in entry-level courses. Paper presented at Georgia TESOL Annual meeting, Marietta, GA.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1990, October). Literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum. Paper presented at Georgia Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.,

Carson, J. G. (1991, October). Writing in academic discourse communities: Student perceptions. Paper presented at Southeast Regional TESOL meeting, Atlanta, GA.

Chase, N. D., Carson, J. G., & Gibson, S. U. (1991, November). Academic literacy demands of high school and college: A comparative study of what students need to know and do. Paper presented at College Reading Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1991, December). Texts, notes, and lectures: Perceptions of reading purposes and demands in college history, political science, English compostion and biology. Paper presented at National Reading Conference, Annual Meeting, Palm Springs, CA.

Carson, J. G. (1992, April). Communicating to the outside world. Paper presented at the Conference on Teaching Academic Survival Skills, Cincinnati, OH.

Carson, J. G. (1993, April). Academic literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum: Integrating the literacy skills. Paper presented at the 27th Annual TESOL Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G. (1993, April). Academic literacy: What ESL teachers need to know. Paper presented at the 27th Annual TESOL Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G. (1993, April). Designing successful grant proposals: Examples from FIPSE. Paper presented at the 27th Annual TESOL Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993, December). A model for faculty collaboration: Focus on academic literacy. Paper to be presented at the AAHE's Fourth National Conference on School/College Collaboration, Pittsburgh, PA.

Commander, N. E. & Gibson, S. U. (1994, March). Active learning: Incorporating debate in the reading classroom. Paper to be presented at the National Association of Developmental Education, Kansas City.

SPEECHES AND WORKSHOPS

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1991, March). Academic literacy and freshman composition. Invited talk to the Department of English, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G. (1991, April). Sociolinguistics and reading instruction. Invited talk sponsored by the Metropolitan Atlanta Council of Developmental Reading Instructors.

Carson, J. G. (1992, February). Where do students learn academic writing? Invited talk sponsored by the Department of English, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, IN.

Carson, J. G. (1992, March). Developing ESL curricula: Insights from FIPSE. Invited talk to ESL faculty, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G. (1993, March). Academic literacy demands: Insights for intensive English programs. Invited talk to the Department of Applied Linguistics, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G. (1993, May). Integrating academic literacy skills: Implications for ESL. Invited talk to the Department of Applied Linguistics, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Chase, N. D. (1993, May). Making the transition in English. Invited talk at Preparing Students for College: Making the transition, Conference sponsored by the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education and the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Gibson, S. U. (1993, May). Making the transition in biology. Invited talk at Preparing Students for College: Making the transition, Conference sponsored by the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education and the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Carson, J. G. (1993, May). Making the Transition in history and political science. Invited talk at Preparing Students for College: Making the transition, Conference sponsored by the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education and the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

REPORTS

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1992). Literacy analyses of high school and university courses: Summary descriptions of selected courses. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University, Center for the Study of Adult Literacy.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993). A model for faculty collaboration: Focus on academic literacy. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University, Center for the Study of Adult Literacy.